arXiv:math/0412286v1 [math.RT] 14 Dec 2004

KAC-MOODY ALGEBRAS AND THE CDE-TRIANGLE

TORSTEN EKEDAHL

Abstract. This is the written version of a talk at the conference on "Non-commutative geometry and representation theory in mathematical physics" held in Karlstad, Sweden, 5–10 July, 2004. In it we show that the duality formula of Rocha-Caridi and Wallach is a simple consequence of the so called cde-triangle of modular representation theory. It tries to reflect the attempt of the talk to cater to the differing backgrounds of its listeners.

The purpose of this note is to give a short proof of the so called duality formula [RCW82] occurring in the representation theory of Kac-Moody Lie algebras. The proof uses techniques from the theory of modular representations, in fact the duality formula turns out to be a special case of the fact that "e is the transpose of d" [Ser78, III,§15]. More precisely, the idea is that for a generic weight, the Verma module is irreducible and one has a semi-simple category of representations. The specific characters are then obtained from a generic character by specialisation, i.e., one constructs Verma modules depending on a parameter such that for the general value the Verma module is irreducible and for a special value we are in the particular situation that we are interested in. In this way the modular set up is over a power series ring in one variable over the base field rather than over a p-local ring. There is a technical difficulty (which is not serious) in that the modules over the Kac-Moody algebra that are considered are not finitely generated over the base ring.

1 The cde-triangle

We shall start by recalling the standard setup for the cde-triangle. We let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local henselian noetherian domain with $K := \mathbf{Frac}\,(R)$, the field of fractions of R, and $\mathbf{k} := R/\mathfrak{m}$, the residue field of R. Recall that R is *Henselian* means that for any finite R-algebra A any idempotent of $A/\mathfrak{m}A$ lifts to an idempotent of A. (Note that a field, which is a local domain with its maximal ideal being the zero ideal, is Henselian for trivial reasons.) In the case that will eventually interest us R will be the formal power series ring $\mathbf{k}[[t]]$ in one variable but there are other choices of interest even in the situation of Kac-Moody algebras. Getting a little ahead of ourselves we could let R be the algebra of formal power series expansions around an element of $\mathfrak{h}^\vee$, the dual of the Cartan subalgebra of the Kac-Moody algebra. One could also replace formal power series with convergent power series if the base field $\mathbf{k}$ is the field of complex numbers. The reader insisting on having a single example in mind would probably be best served to let $\mathbf{k}$ be $\mathbf{C}$, the field of complex numbers, and $R = \mathbf{C}[[t]]$ the ring of formal power series in one variable over $\mathbf{C}$. In that case $\mathfrak{m} = tR$. (The case that occurs in the original setup, that of modular representation theory, is when R equals the ring of p-adic integers or an extension of it obtained by adjoining some roots of unity).

We now assume that we are given an associative R-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with unit which is finitely generated and free as an R-module. In concrete terms that means that we are given a basis $e_1 = 1, e_2, \ldots, e_n$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and structure constants $a^k_{ij} \in R$ with $e_i e_j = \sum_k a^k_{ij} e_k$ fulfilling the appropriate conditions making e_1 a unit element and makes the multiplication associative. In the context of representation theory of Lie algebras a good example to have in mind is the *Hecke algebra*, $\mathcal{H}$, of a Weyl group (associated to a finite dimensional semi-simple Lie algebra), where the parameter q is considered as a formal parameter and $R = \mathbf{C}[[q - \zeta]]$, the ring of formal expansions around ζ, a root of unity. We get from $\mathcal{A}$ two algebras over fields, the scalar extension of $\mathcal{A}$ to K, $A := \mathcal{A} \bigotimes_R K$, and the scalar extension to $\mathbf{k}$, $\overline{A} := \mathcal{A} \bigotimes_R \mathbf{k} = A/\mathfrak{m}A$. Using

---

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 17B10; Secondary 17B67
Keywords and phrases. Modular representations, duality formula

the concrete description in terms of structure constants, the first algebra A simply considers the structure constants as elements of K and for the second algebra one reduces them modulo $\mathfrak{m}$. We now assume that A is a semi-simple algebra (i.e., isomorphic to a product of matrix algebras over some extension field of K) but make no such assumption on $\overline{A}$. In the case of Hecke algebras it is known that for appropriate choices of root of unity ζ one can get examples for which $\overline{H}$ is not semi-simple. For the simplest case of a Weyl group of type A_1 we have a basis $1, \sigma$ with $\sigma^2 = (q-1)\sigma + q$ and hence for $q = -1$ we get a non-simple algebra so we can pick $\zeta = -1$.

Recall now that a (finitely generated) $\mathcal{A}$-, A-, or $\overline{A}$-module P is *projective* if for every *surjective* map $g\colon M \to N$ of modules and every module homomorphism $f\colon P \to N$ there is a *lifting* $h\colon P \to M$ making the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M \arrow[d, "g"] \\
P \arrow[ur, dashed, "h"] \arrow[r, "f"'] & N
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutative.

The first thing to note is that for the semi-simple algebra A this condition is trivial; every surjective map $g\colon M \to N$ is *split*, i.e., there is a map of A-modules $g'\colon N \to M$ such that $g \circ g'$ is the identity map. Thus we can find a splitting no matter what P is by putting $h = g' \circ f$. Hence in the semi-simple case a simple (or irreducible) module has two properties; it is simple (!) and it is projective. In the non-semi simple case these two properties are not connected anymore, simple modules are usually not projective and vice versa. Usually it is the simple modules one is really interested in but the condition defining projectivity is a very useful one and the projective modules play at the very least an important auxiliary rôle. More precisely, as we shall see momentarily, the *indecomposable* (i.e., those that cannot be written as a non-trivial direct sum) projective modules are closely related to the simple modules.

An important example of a projective module is the algebra itself. A module homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ (resp. A or $\overline{A}$) to a module M is completely determined by where it maps the identity element and any element of M is such an image. Hence the projectivity follows directly from the assumption that $M \to N$ is surjective. It is also easy to see that a direct summand of a projective module is projective. We can write $\mathcal{A}$ as a direct sum of indecomposable projective modules and these will then all be projective. We shall now see that the isomorphism classes of these indecomposable projectives are in bijection with the isomorphism classes of the simple modules. For this we need to start by expounding on the significance of the condition that R is Henselian for indecomposable modules.

Essentially by definition a module M (over $\mathcal{A}$, A, or $\overline{A}$) is indecomposable precisely when its endomorphism ring contains no non-trivial idempotents. Now, if M is finitely generated as R-module (resp. as K- or $\mathbf{k}$-vector space) then so is its endomorphism ring and by the Henselian property of R its reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ contains no non-trivial idempotents. Now, it is a fact that a finite dimensional algebra over a field with no non-trivial idempotents is *local*, i.e., if the sum of two elements is invertible then of the elements is invertible. This property can then be lifted back to the original endomorphism ring. Note that we only used that the endomorphism ring was finitely generated so for future use we record the conclusion as: *If the endomorphism ring of an indecomposable module is finitely generated over R, K, or $\mathbf{k}$, then it is a local ring.* This result can to begin with then be combined with the Krull-Schmidt theorem which says that the summands of direct sums of modules whose endomorphism rings are local can be recovered (up to isomorphism) from the direct sum, i.e., we have uniqueness of the summands of a direct sum decomposition. This may not be strictly necessary for our arguments but is certainly reassuring...

More seriously we want to use this property to give a bijection between (isomorphism classes of) indecomposable projective modules and (isomorphism classes of) simple modules. It follows from the following more precise result.

Proposition 1.1 *Let P be a finitely generated indecomposable projective $\mathcal{A}$-, A-, or $\overline{A}$-module.*

i) P contains a unique maximal submodule M_P and the association $P \mapsto P/M_P$ gives a bijection between isomorphism classes of finitely generated indecomposable projective modules and simple modules.

ii) P is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathcal{A}$, A, or $\overline{A}$ respectively.

Proof: The existence of a maximal submodule follows immediately from the fact that P is finitely generated (as the union of an increasing sequence of proper submodules can not be all of P). Assume therefore that there are two distinct maximal modules $M, N \subset P$. As they are distinct we get that the "diagonal" map $P \to P/M\bigoplus P/N$ is surjective. Using the lifting property of P we may complete the following diagram with $f\colon P \to P$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[rr, dashed, "f"] \arrow[d] & & P \arrow[d] \\
P/M\bigoplus P/N \arrow[r, "p_1"] & P/M \arrow[r, "i_1"] & P/M\bigoplus P/N,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where p_1 is the projection on the first factor and i_1 is the inclusion in the first factor. Now, as the endomorphism ring of P is local and as $1 = f + (1 - f)$ we have that one of f and $1 - f$ is invertible. It is clear that $1 - f$ induces the composite map $P/M\bigoplus P/N \xrightarrow{p_2} P/N \xrightarrow{i_2}$ and hence neither f nor $1 - f$ can be an isomorphism as if it were, then it would induce a surjective map $P/M\bigoplus P/N \to P/M\bigoplus P/N$ which is visibly not the case.

Assume now that Q is another indecomposable finitely generated projective with a surjective map $Q \to P/M_P$. By the projectivity of Q there is a lifting of the map $Q \to P/M_P$ to a map $Q \to P$. This map is surjective as if not its image is a proper submodule of P and is hence contained in M_P contradicting the surjectivity of $Q \to P/M/P$. By the projectivity of P the surjective mapping $Q \to P$ has a splitting $P \to Q$ which makes P a direct summand of Q which by the indecomposability of Q implies that P is isomorphic to Q.

Finally, if M is a simple module, picking $0 \neq m \in M$ we get a module homomorphism $\mathcal{A} \to M$ (resp...) taking 1 to m. Its restriction to some indecomposable summand P of must be non-zero giving a non-zero map $P \to M$ but as M is simple this map is surjective. Hence, every simple module M is of the form P/M_P for P a direct summand of A. This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

Remark: Every indecomposable projective module is finitely generated.

We shall call this indecomposable projective $\mathcal{A}$-module (resp...) which has a given simple module as quotient the *projective cover* of the simple module. In the case of A-modules a simple module is its own projective cover but this is in general not true for $\mathcal{A}$ or $\bar{A}$. Note now that every $\bar{A}$-module can be considered as an $\mathcal{A}$-module by the (surjective) map $\mathcal{A} \to \bar{A}$ given by reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$. This identifies the $\bar{A}$-modules with the $\mathcal{A}$-modules that are killed by $\mathfrak{m}$. Note also that a simple $\bar{A}$-module is simple as an $\mathcal{A}$-module. In fact all simple $\mathcal{A}$-modules M are obtained in this way. Indeed, M is finitely generated as $\mathcal{A}$-module as it is generated by any of its non-zero elements and in particular it is finitely generated as an R-module. Hence Nakayama's lemma says that $\mathfrak{m}M \neq M$ and as it is an $\mathcal{A}$-submodule it must be zero as M is simple. Hence, the proposition shows that we get a bijection between indecomposable projective modules over $\mathcal{A}$ and over $\bar{A}$. We shall see shortly that this bijection is realised by associating to the projective indecomposable $\mathcal{A}$-module P the $\bar{A}$-module $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P = P/\mathfrak{m}P$. We start however by introducing some notation.

A $\mathcal{A}$-*lattice* is a $\mathcal{A}$-module which is finitely generated and free as an R-module. (Hence choosing an R-basis of it, the elements of $\mathcal{A}$ become represented by matrices with entries in R.) Note that indecomposable projective modules are always lattices as they are direct summands of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is a lattice (direct summands of finitely generated free R-modules are free as R is local). We then have the following key result.

Proposition 1.2 *i) Let M be an $\mathcal{A}$-lattice and P an indecomposable projective $\mathcal{A}$-module. Then we have that the R-module of $\mathcal{A}$-homomorphisms* $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,M)$ *is finitely generated and free. Furthermore, we have that*

$$K\bigotimes_R \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,M) = \mathrm{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P, K\bigotimes_R M)$$

and

$$\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{A}}(\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P, \mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R M).$$

In particular $\dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P, K\bigotimes_R M) = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{A}}(\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P, \mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R M)$.

ii) Assume (for simplicity) that for every simple A-module M (resp. every simple $\bar{A}$-module $\overline{M}$) we have that $\mathrm{End}_A(M) = K$ *(resp.* $\mathrm{End}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{M}) = \mathbf{k}$*). Then for any finitely generated A-module N (resp. finitely generated $\bar{A}$-module $\overline{N}$) and any simple A-module (resp. simple $\bar{A}$-module) M (resp. $\overline{M}$) with projective cover P (resp. $\overline{P}$) we have that* $\dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N)$ *(resp.* $\dim_{\mathbf{k}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{P},\overline{N})$*) is equal to the number of times that M (resp. $\overline{M}$) appears in a Jordan-Hölder sequence of N (resp. $\overline{N}$).*

Proof: We know that P is a direct summand of $\mathcal{A}$ and the statement behaves well with respect to taking direct sums. Hence we may replace P by A and then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A,M) = A$ by the map $f \mapsto f(1)$ and similarly for the A and $\bar{A}$ case. This makes the case $P = A$ of i) obvious.

As for ii) we prove it by induction over the length of N (the proof for $\overline{N}$ is identical) which is finite as M is of finite dimension. If N is simple then any homomorphism $P \to N$ factors through $P \to M$ so that $\mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N) = \mathrm{Hom}_A(M,N)$ and by Schur's lemma $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M,N) = 0$ if M and N are non-isomorphic and $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M,N)$ is 1-dimensional by assumption if M and N are isomorphic. This takes care of the case of length 1. In the general case choose $N' \subset N$ of length 1. We then have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N/N') \to 0,$$

where the all but the right most exactness is true in general and the right most exactness is precisely the lifting property for the projective module P. Counting dimensions we get $\dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N) = \dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N/N') + \dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_A(P,N')$ which gives the result by induction. □

Remark: The concrete content of the first part is the following: We may choose an R-basis for P and M and then the action of an element $\mathcal{A}$ on P resp. M are given by matrices with entries in R. The corresponding matrices for $K\bigotimes_R P$ and $K\bigotimes_R M$ are then obtained by considering the entries as elements of K and the matrices for $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P$ and $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R M$ are obtained by reducing the entries modulo $\mathfrak{m}$. The R-module of $\mathcal{A}$-homomorphisms $P \to M$ then consists of the R-matrices that commute with those of $\mathcal{A}$ and similarly for the K- resp. $\mathbf{k}$-vector space of homomorphism $K\bigotimes_R P \to K\bigotimes_R M$ resp. $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P \to \mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R M$.

We may choose an R-basis for the R-module of $\mathcal{A}$-homomorphisms $P \to M$ and then the first part says that this basis forms a K-basis for the K-vector space of A-homomorphisms $K\bigotimes_R P \to K\bigotimes_R M$ whereas the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ form a basis for the space of $\bar{A}$-homomorphisms $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R P \to \mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R M$. The K-part is true without assuming that P is projective but the $\mathbf{k}$-part does require that assumption.

As a first application we can consider the relation between indecomposable projective $\mathcal{A}$-modules and indecomposable projective $\bar{A}$-modules. Indeed, if P is an indecomposable projective $\mathcal{A}$-module then $\overline{P} := P/\mathfrak{m}P$ is an indecomposable projective $\bar{A}$-module. That it is projective is clear as any $\mathcal{A}$-homomorphism $P \to M$ where M is an $\bar{A}$-module factors through $P \to \overline{P}$ so that the lifting property for P implies that for $\overline{P}$. On the other hand, it follows from the proposition that $\mathrm{End}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{P},\overline{P})$ is equal to $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,P)/\mathfrak{m}\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,P)$ and the Henselian property of R implies that as $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(P,P)$ has no non-trivial idempotents neither does $\mathrm{End}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{P},\overline{P})$ so that $\overline{P}$ is indeed indecomposable.

For the rest of this section we assume that *the maximal ideal* $\mathfrak{m}$ *of* R *is generated by a single element* (the standard example of $R = \mathbf{k}[[t]]$ fulfills this condition as does the original example of p-adic numbers). What it means for us is that any finitely generated R-submodule of a K-vector space is free which makes it much easier to construct $\mathcal{A}$-lattices.

Let now $M_1, \dots, M_k$ be a complete set of simple A-modules (up to isomorphism) and $\overline{M}_1, \dots, \overline{M}_\ell$ a complete set of simple $\bar{A}$-modules. We shall now define three integer matrices, the *decomposition matrix* D, the *Cartan matrix* C, and a matrix E (which doesn't seem to have acquired a standard name). For a simple A-module (resp. $\bar{A}$-module) and an A-module (resp. $\bar{A}$-module) N of finite length we put $[N : M]$ equal to the number of times M appears in a Jordan-Hölder sequence of N. We let D_{ij} for $1 \le i \le \ell$ and $1 \le j \le k$ in the following way. We choose an $\mathcal{A}$-lattice $\mathcal{M}_j \subset M_j$ such that $M_j = K\mathcal{M}_j$. Such a lattice is easily constructed by taking a basis of M_j and letting $\mathcal{M}_k$ be the $\mathcal{A}$-module generated by the basis. We then let $D_{ij} := [\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j : \overline{M}_i]$. By giving a different formula for this integer we shall see that it is independent of the choice of $\mathcal{M}_j$ but this can also be shown directly. (Note that the module $\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j$ depends in general on the choice of $\mathcal{M}_j$, the statement is that the components of a Jordan-Hölder is independent of such a choice.) We define the matrix E_{ji} for $1 \le i \le \ell$ and $1 \le j \le k$ as follows: We consider the projective cover P_i of $\overline{M}_i$ considered as an $\mathcal{A}$-module and put $E_{ji} := [K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_j]$. Finally, We define C_{ij} for $1 \le i, j \le \ell$ as $[\overline{P}_j : \overline{M}_i]$. The basic result concerning these matrices is the following.

Proposition 1.3 *Assume that the endomorphism rings of the* M_j *and the* $\overline{M}_i$ *are equal to the base fields (*K *resp.* $\mathbf{k}$*).*

i) We have that $E = D^t$*, the transpose matrix, i.e.,* $[\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j : \overline{M}_i] = [K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_j]$*, where* $\mathcal{M}_j$ *is an* $\mathcal{A}$*-lattice such that* $K\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j = M_j$ *and* P_i *a* $\mathcal{A}$*-projective cover of* $\overline{M}_i$*.*

ii) We have that $C = DD^t$*, i.e.,*

$$[\overline{P}_j : \overline{M}_i] = \sum_k [\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j : \overline{M}_k][K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_k].$$

Proof: We get from Proposition 1.2 that

$$[\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j : \overline{M}_i] = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} \operatorname{Hom}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{P}_i, \mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j) = \dim_K \operatorname{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P_i, M_j)$$

but as A is semi-simple we have that $K\bigotimes_R P_i$ is the direct sum of simple modules and consequently $\dim_K \operatorname{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P_i, M_j)$ is equal to the number of times M_j occurs in $K\bigotimes_R P_i$, i.e., is equal to $[(K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_j]$.

As for the second part we have that $[\overline{P}_j : \overline{M}_i] = \dim_{\mathbf{k}} \operatorname{Hom}_{\bar{A}}(\overline{P}_i, \overline{P}_j)$ and that is equal to $\dim_K \operatorname{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P_i, K\bigotimes_R P_j)$. Writing $K\bigotimes_R P_i$ and $K\bigotimes_R P_j$ is a direct sum of M_k's where M_k occurs with multiplicity $[K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_k]$ resp. $[K\bigotimes_R P_j : M_k]$. This gives that $\dim_K \operatorname{Hom}_A(K\bigotimes_R P_i, K\bigotimes_R P_j)$ is equal to $\sum_k [K\bigotimes_R P_i : M_k][K\bigotimes_R P_j : M_k]$ which is equal to $\sum_k [\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_i : \overline{M}_k][\mathbf{k}\bigotimes_R \mathcal{M}_j : \overline{M}_k]$ by the first part which proves the result. □

Example: Consider the case of the Hecke algebra of type A_2. It has two generators σ and τ with relations $(\sigma - q)(\sigma + 1) = 0 = (\tau - q)(\tau + 1)$ and $\sigma\tau\sigma = \tau\sigma\tau$. Furthermore, it is 6-dimensional with a basis with elements 1, σ, τ, $\sigma\tau$, $\tau\sigma$, and $\sigma\tau\sigma$. (Note also that the Dynkin diagram has a binary symmetry which gives an automorphism of the Hecke algebra exchanging σ and τ which can be used to simplify the statements to follow.) For any q it has two 1-dimensional representations given by letting both σ and τ act by -1 resp. by q. For general q (more precisely when $q \ne 0, -1, e^{\pm 2\pi i/3}$) this algebra is semi-simple and has these two 1-dimensional irreducible representations and one 2-dimensional. If we let $q \mapsto e^{\pm 2\pi i/3}$ then the two 1-dimensional representations are the *only* irreducible representations. Furthermore, their projective covers are 3-dimensional. Hence if we let $R = \mathbf{C}[[q - \zeta]]$, where $\zeta = e^{\pm 2\pi i/3}$ we have two projective modules P_1 and P_2 which are the projective covers of the two modules M_1 and M_2 of rank 1. The kernels of $P_i \to M_i$ are of rank 2 isomorphic to the irreducible 2-dimensional module when scalars are extended to K. That gives the following form for the E-matrix

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and then the decomposition matrix D is its transpose whereas the Cartan matrix is

$$E^t E = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If one instead considers the case of $R = \mathbf{C}[[q]]$, then for $q = 0$ we have 4 1-dimensional representations for $\sigma, \tau = 0, 1$. The two representations where $\sigma, \tau = 0$ or $\sigma, \tau = 1$ are also projective while the projective covers of the representations where $\sigma + \tau = 1$ have projective covers of dimension 2. Note that these two latter projective covers over $\mathbf{k}[[q]]$ are two distinct lattices (as they are the covers of two distinct simple modules) yet their K-linear extension to representations over $\mathbf{k}((q))$, the field of formal Laurent series, are isomorphic. This gives an example of two non-isomorphic lattices in the same representation over $\mathbf{k}((q))$. Their reductions modulo q are still non-isomorphic but they do indeed have the same components of their Jordan-Hölder sequences. In any case we have

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2 Projective modules over Kac-Moody algebras

We now intend to do the theory presented in the previous section for modules over a Kac-Moody algebra. The modules that we shall consider will only very rarely be finitely generated as R-modules. However, going through the previous section one realises that the important thing is that the R-module of homomorphisms between modules is finitely generated (and at a few points that the module itself is finitely generated). These two properties will remain true for the modules that we shall consider.

Assume that $\mathbf{k}$ has characteristic zero. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Kac-Moody algebra over R, which we will take to mean that it is obtained by extending scalars of some Kac-Moody algebra defined over some subfield of R. We put $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g} \bigotimes_R K$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{g}} := \mathfrak{g} \bigotimes_R k$ and we shall generally let $(-)'$ resp. $\overline{(-)}$ denote extension of scalars to K resp. $\mathbf{k}$. By a *weight* we shall mean an R-linear map from the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ to R. As usual we have the roots of $\mathfrak{g}$ as particular examples of weights. If M is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module and λ a weight we define, unsurprisingly, the weight space

$$M_\lambda := \{m \in M : \forall t \in \mathfrak{h}; tm = \lambda(t)m\},$$

where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the Cartan subalgebra. Let Γ be a finite set of weights such that no two distinct elements of $\Gamma + \Delta^-$ are congruent modulo $\mathfrak{m}$, where Δ^- denotes the set of negative weights. We then let $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ be the category of finitely generated $\mathfrak{g}$-modules M for which M is the sum of the M_λ for $\lambda \in \Gamma + \Delta^-$ and for which all the M_λ are finitely generated R-modules. Our assumption on Γ then implies that M is in fact the direct sum of its weight spaces. We shall say that M is a $\mathfrak{g}$-lattice if all the M_λ are free finitely generated R-modules. We let Γ' resp. $\overline{\Gamma}$ denote the set of induced $\mathfrak{g}'$- resp. $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$-weights and then $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma'}$ resp. $\mathcal{M}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$ have their obvious meaning. We shall now prove some results imitating [RCW82]. Recall that a set $\{P\}$ of projective modules form a *set of generators* if for every non-zero module M, there is a non-zero homomorphism $P \to M$. In the case of an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ we have seen that the algebra itself is a generator and that implies that the set of indecomposable summands of $\mathcal{A}$ form a set of generators. That they do was a crucial step in showing that every simple module had a projective cover which was a summand of $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 2.1 *i) Let $M, N \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathfrak{g}(M,N)$ is finitely generated as R-module.*

ii) $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ has a set of indecomposable projective generators which all are $\mathfrak{g}$-lattices. Reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ gives a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of those and the corresponding set relative to $\mathcal{M}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$.

iii) If $P \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ is projective and M is a $\mathfrak{g}$-lattice then $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathfrak{g}(M,N)$ is R-projective, $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathfrak{g}(M,N)' = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}'}(M',N')$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_\mathfrak{g}(M,N)\bigotimes_R k = \mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{g}}}(\overline{M},\overline{N})$.

Proof: As M is finitely generated, any $\mathfrak{g}$-map $M \to N$ is determined by its restriction to a fixed finite set of weight spaces all of which are, by assumption, finitely generated as R-modules. This observation gives i). As for ii) we follow [RCW82] in first constructing a set of projective generators. Let therefore $\lambda \in \Gamma + \Delta^-$ and let $N(\lambda)$ be the $\mathfrak{h}$-module of rank 1 corresponding to λ. Induce first up to $\mathfrak{b}$, the Borel algebra, and factor out by the submodule consisting of those weight spaces whose weights do not belong to $\Gamma + \Delta^-$. This gives a $\mathfrak{b}$-module $Q(\lambda)$ finitely generated free as an R-module. Induce then up to $\mathfrak{g}$ to get $P(\lambda)$. As R-module $Q(\lambda)$ is a direct summand of $N(\lambda)\bigotimes_R U(\mathfrak{n})$ and is hence R-free. Similarly, $P(\lambda) = Q(\lambda)\bigotimes_R U(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ and so is R-free. As $Q(\lambda)$ is a sum of weight spaces, so is P_λ and therefore P_λ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-lattice being generated by $Q(\lambda)$. Finally, by construction, for every $\mathfrak{g}$-module M in $\mathcal{M}_\Gamma$ and every $m \in M_\lambda$ there is a unique map of $\mathfrak{h}$-modules $N(\lambda) \to M$ taking the generator v of $N(\lambda)_\lambda$ to m. It induces a map $Q(\lambda) \to M$ of $\mathfrak{b}$-modules taking $1 \otimes v$ to m and finally inducing to $\mathfrak{g}$ gives a map $P(\lambda) \to M$ taking $1 \otimes (1 \otimes v)$ to m. Thus a map $P(\lambda) \to M$ is the same thing as an element $m \in M_\lambda$ and hence $P(\lambda)$ is projective as a surjective map $M \to N$ induces a surjective map $M_\lambda \to N_\lambda$. They also form a set of generators as if $M \neq 0$ we have that $M_\lambda \neq 0$ for some λ. Being finitely generated $P(\lambda)$ is a direct sum of indecomposables and as the $P(\lambda)$ form a set of generators so do the set of such indecomposable summands of some $P(\lambda)$.

The rest of the proof is almost identical to the proofs of the corresponding results of Section 1. Hence for instance every indecomposable projective module contains a maximal submodule as it is finitely generated and the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ of an indecomposable projective is still indecomposable by the liftability of idempotents as the endomorphism ring is finitely generated as an R-module. The details are left to the reader. □

Let us introduce some notation. For each $\mathbf{k}$-weight λ we let $\overline{Z}(\lambda)$ denote the corresponding Verma module, $\overline{V}(\lambda)$ the irreducible $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$-module of highest weight λ and, supposing $\lambda \in \overline{\Gamma} + \Delta^-$, we let $\overline{I}(\lambda)$ the indecomposable projective, in $\mathcal{M}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$, which is the projective cover of $V(\lambda)$. Similarly, the variations $Z(\lambda)$, $I(\lambda)$, $Z(\lambda)'$ and $V(\lambda)'$ should be self-explanatory.

3 The duality theorem

We are now going to prove the duality theorem. The idea is to consider a 1-parameter family of weights which for a general value of the parameter give a category of modules that is semi-simple, i.e., every module is a direct sum of simple modules, for which the simple modules are the Verma modules. The Verma modules for a special value of the parameter then appears as the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ of a Verma module over R, which in turn is an R-lattice insider of the simple Verma module for the general value of the weight. This shows that the decomposition matrix describes the simple components of a Verma module. On the other hand Rocha-Caridi gives a (more or less) explicit filtration of an indecomposable projective module whose successive quotients are Verma modules. This works *mutatis mutandis* in the R-case and then gives a Jordan-Hölder sequence when scalars are extended to K and hence give the E-matrix. Thus interpreted the duality theorem is simply the statement that $E = D^t$.

We now specialise to $R = \mathbf{k}[[t]]$ and also assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is induced from $\mathbf{k}$, i.e., that $\mathfrak{g} = \overline{\mathfrak{g}}\bigotimes_\mathbf{k}[[t]]$. Let $\overline{\Gamma}$ be a finite set of $\mathbf{k}$-weights. We lift $\overline{\Gamma}$ to a set of R-weights as follows. Choose a basis $\{e_i\}$ of $\mathfrak{h}$ and $f_i \in t\mathbf{k}[[t]]$ which are algebraically independent over $\mathbf{k}$ ($\mathbf{k}((t))$ has infinite transcendence degree over $\mathbf{k}$ so this is always possible) and let Λ be the R-weight for which $\Lambda(e_i) = f_i$. Put now $\Gamma := \{\gamma + \Lambda : \gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}\}$ where we are considering $\mathbf{k}$-weights as R-weights in the obvious way. As the f_i belongs to $t\mathbf{k}[[t]]$ the reduction mod t of Γ gives $\overline{\Gamma}$ showing the consistency of notation.

Lemma 3.1 *The category $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma'}$ is semi-simple with the Verma modules $Z(\lambda)'$ for $\lambda \in \Gamma' + \Delta^-$ as irreducible objects, i.e., every module in $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma'}$ is a direct sum of Verma modules.*

PROOF: According to [KK79, Thm. 1] there is a countable set of hyperplanes in $\mathfrak{h}^\vee$ such that if λ is a K-root not lying on any of them, then the canonical pairing [KK79] on $Z(\lambda)$ is non-degenerate and as its radical is the maximal proper submodule, $Z(\lambda)$ is irreducible. Now, as any $\lambda \in \Gamma' + \Delta^-$ has $\mathbf{k}$-algebraically independent coordinates it therefore follows that $Z(\lambda)'$ is irreducible, i.e., it equals $V(\lambda)'$. To show semi-simplicity it therefore remains to show that any extension

$$0 \to Z(\lambda)' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow Z(\mu)' \to 0$$

is trivial. If $\mu \notin \lambda + (\Delta^- \setminus \{0\})$, then the highest weight vector of $Z(\mu)'$ lifts to a highest weight vector of M and the extension splits. If $\mu \in \lambda + (\Delta^- \setminus \{0\})$ then we take duals. Here the dual $N^\vee$ of an $N \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma'}$ means the following: Take the set of linear maps $N \to K$ which vanish on all but a finite set of the weight spaces and consider it as a $\mathfrak{g}$-module through the standard action composed with the canonical involution of $\mathfrak{g}$ (which takes a root to its negative). In this way the dual becomes an involutive anti-equivalence of $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma'}$ to itself and the dual of a Verma module is easily seen to be equal to itself. Therefore, $M^\vee$ is an extension of $Z(\lambda)'$ by $Z(\mu)'$ and as $\lambda \notin \mu + (\Delta^- \setminus \{0\})$ the extension splits and by duality so does the original one. $\square$

Proposition 3.2 *For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_\Gamma$, $I(\lambda)$ has a finite filtration the successive quotients of which are Verma modules.*

PROOF: The proof of [RCW82] goes through without changes. Indeed, using the notation of Lemma 2.1 we can filter $Q(\lambda)$ with successive quotients being free of rank 1 as R-modules and with $\mathfrak{n}$ acting trivially and inducing such a module to $\mathfrak{g}$ gives a Verma module. $\square$

Let us now, following [RCW82], put $[\overline{Z}(\lambda) : \overline{V}(\mu)]$ equal to the multiplicity of $\overline{V}(\mu)$ in a composition series for $\overline{Z}(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\overline{\Gamma}}$ and $[\overline{I}(\lambda) : \overline{Z}(\mu)]$ equal to the multiplicity of $\overline{Z}(\mu)$ in a series as in Lemma 3.2 (with Γ replaced by $\overline{\Gamma}$).

Theorem 3.3 *(cf. [RCW82, Thm. 4]) For any $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Gamma} + \Delta^-$ we have $[\overline{Z}(\Lambda) : \overline{V}(\mu)] = [\overline{I}(\mu) : \overline{Z}(\Lambda)]$.*

PROOF: As $\mathrm{End}_{\overline{\mathfrak{g}}}(\overline{V}(\mu)) = \mathbf{k}$ we get that $[\overline{Z}(\lambda) : \overline{V}(\mu)] = \dim_k \mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathfrak{g}}}(\overline{I}(\mu), \overline{Z}(\lambda))$. By Lemma 2.1:iii) this equals $\dim_K \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}'}(I(\mu)', Z(\lambda)')$, which by Lemma 3.1 equals the number of times $Z(\lambda)'$ occurs in $I(\mu)'$. By Lemma 3.2 this equals the number of times $\overline{Z}(\lambda)$ occurs in $\overline{I}(\lambda)$, i.e., $[\overline{I}(\mu) : \overline{Z}(\lambda)]$. $\square$

References

[KK79] Viktor G. Kac and David A. Kazhdan, *Structure of representations with highest weight of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Adv. in Math. **34** (1979), no. 1, 97–108.

[RCW82] Alvany Rocha-Caridi and Nolan R. Wallach, *Projective modules over graded Lie algebras. I*, Math. Z. **180** (1982), no. 2, 151–177.

[Ser78] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Représentations linéaires des groupes finis*, revised ed., Hermann, Paris, 1978.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY, SE-106 91 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN
E-mail address: `teke@math.su.se`